

Paper: “Examining the Relationship Between the Aspects of School Working Conditions and Teachers’ Intent to Stay as Mediated by Job Satisfaction”

Submitted: 14 April 2022

Accepted: 28 April 2022

Published: 30 April 2022

Corresponding Author: Pai Peng

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n12p213](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n12p213)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jelena Zascerinska
University of Latvia, Latvia

Reviewer 2: Ugyen Phuntsho
Ministry of Education : Thimphu, Trongsa, BT

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is well suited to the subject.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is well formulated, both in terms of methods and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

I don't feel qualified to judge about the English language and style

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study method is appropriately described.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the document is clear and correctly written and does not require additional language corrections.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

the conclusion is supported by the content

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is comprehensive and appropriate

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In this paper, the authors study the correlations that may exist between aspects of school working conditions, job satisfaction and teachers' intention to stay. The paper's subject is interesting. The paper presentation is well. The result and method are presented clearly. The research work presented by the authors remains original. Overall, the results are interesting and deserve to be published in the ESJ in the present form.

Reviewer F:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The author name Cohen-Vogel differs in the intent citation and the list of references: "v" is written as the capital and just a letter.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are well explained.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body is well structured.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusions are accurate and supported by the content. The limitation of the research are shown, the further work directions are proposed.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is comprehensive and appropriate. The list is a good combination of classical works as well as contemporary research results.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Thank you for the interesting paper!
The focus on your contribution highlighted in the paper is helpful for a deeper research understanding.

Reviewer G:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and specific

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract clearly mentioned object, methods and result.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The use of word Relationship is inconsistent, in the title was written as relationship, and in the abstract is written as relationships. Need to use letter 's' consistently need to use the same term consistently and uniformly.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods were explained clearly

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is clear, however, there are numerous error of in-text citation. Discussion reads weak as researcher simply discussed on the agreement of this paper with earlier studies findings. Discussion part need more than this in making a critical argument in context of the study.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusions presented read shallow for the findings drawn from huge sample of 833 teachers.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The in-text citation /reference need to be corrected.

The end reference list doesn't appears as per the APA format in the manuscript sent for me (reviewer). Check and correct.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The citation need major revision referring the 7th Edition APA
The discussion part need to have author claim/view/argument with supported by literature.

Reviewer H:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is appropriate and suits the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is brief and precise and contains methods and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The grammatical mistakes, errors and spelling mistakes are few. However, thorough reading should be done next time to select appropriate diction.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are clearly explained, however, enough justification should be provided next time.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The article is systematically presented. Adequate empirical review, meta-analytical review, conceptual and theoretical review must be considered in future research.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion, must always reflect the objectives of the study and specific stakeholder based recommendations presented.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

All cited in-text references must be alphabetically and systematically presented to suit the recommended Referencing style of the Journal.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Read through the article carefully, consider grammatical errors, spelling mistakes and diction. Empirical, conceptual and theoretical review must be systematical presented and presented based on objectives of the study. The background of the study should reflect on the objectives of the study and finally the statement of the problem clearly stated. There should be enough justification for the methods selected which should suit the research Philosophy. The analysis and discussions should be clearly explained and based on research questions. Justifications should be provided for the statistics selected for this research. The conclusions should be based on the outcome of the analysis and discussions of the study. Stake holder based recommendations should be provided based on the objectives of the study. All the references should be at the reference list, author must follow the Journal specific referencing style for all listed references.

Reviewer I:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title of the paper is clear and describes the content adequately.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, the abstract presents the methods and results of the paper clearly. More background information could be provided.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are some grammatical errors and punctuation and mechanics problems that need to be taken care of in the revision.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

I am less qualified to assess quantitative methods. But the lack of analysis controlling for 'demographic' factors, as admitted by the authors, weakens the overall quality of the paper.

Qualitative data is limited in contextualizing the study, but giving sample questions in the data analysis might compensate some of these limitations. Attaching the questionnaire as annex or supplementary online material might enhance the contextual information needed badly in the paper. A clear statement on how the questionnaire was developed or adapted and piloted might be helpful information in this regard.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The authors argued: "Most of the previous studies examined teacher retention at the beginning stages of their career or late-career teachers separately, but very few have focused on beginning career, mid-career, and veteran teachers in one framework. Therefore, this study will provide insight into the understanding of teachers' retention across all career spans because teachers' motivations, commitments, and practices differ according to career stages." But the authors of this manuscript have not indicated as to why teacher retention across the different stages of teacher career were not examined by other researchers. And again, the authors hint that motivation, commitments and practices differ across career stages without really showing or supporting their claims with data or analysis. In short, we see from the study teachers at different stages of their career have different levels of intention to stay. We know qualitative data is acknowledged as limited in the study, but it might be worthwhile and feasible to do quantitative analysis on which of the different factors in the study affect teachers at different stages of their career.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

In the conclusion section, authors stated that “Our findings revealed that the intervention actions on the aspects of school condition should aim to enhance teachers’ job satisfaction to ensure their continuity in the profession.” This has to be rewritten to better indicate the implications of the findings to future interventions.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are extensive.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Authors could consider making the distinction more clearly between the study being school administration or leadership focused instead of schools as a learning site. May be this could help exclude a question that asks about the relationship between teachers' intent to stay and overall learning achievement measures of the school.
